Vietnam War Far From Over, P. 4

A Lightning Flash From The Lower Depths

Michael Tabor said he had become addicted to heroin at the age of 13 because he "began to feel very depressed" and the drug "served the purpose of blurring certain ugly realities of ghetto experience." Heroin helped "my nose not to smell the urine-soaked hallways. I didn't feel the garbage underfoot, I didn't hear the sound of police sirens tearing through the black jungle." —Testimony at the Panther 21 trial. *New York Times*, Feb. 12.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL XVIII, NO. 4 FEBRUARY 23, 1970 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

Nixon's Iron Curtain on the Cost of the War

Nixon's new budget takes secrecy in government two steps beyond LBJ. Nixon has blacked out the cost of the war in Vietnam and he has also blacked out military spending from his budgetary projections for the next four years. "A budget," Nixon said in his message, "must be a blueprint for the future." In his blueprint these two main parts are missing. "In the past," Nixon said about his new four-year projections, "the Federal government has been unwilling to pull all the pieces together and present the results of projecting Government finances into the future." He said this was essential for "an enlightened discussion of public policies even though precise figures are, of course, impossible." Why then omit expenditures which eat up more than half the general revenues of the government?

The Explanations Are Contradictory

Contradictory explanations have been given for blacking out the cost of the war. In the press briefings which preceded the release of the budget, the Pentagon briefers disagreed with the Budget Bureau briefers. The Pentagon briefers said the figures had been left out deliberately, so as not to tip off the President's plans. Budget Director Robert P. Mayo, on the other hand, implied that no such figure had been calculated. A Pentagon official put it bluntly to a persistent newsman, "I didn't say there wasn't a dollar figure. I am saying I am not going to tell you what it is." The clearest statement on the record is hidden away on p. 81 of the main budget volume. "We expect," it says —

that further troop withdrawals can be made in the future. However, U.S. actions depend upon the actions of the other side in Paris and on the battlefield, as well as progress in Vietnamization. Consequently estimates are not shown for either the size or the timing of our future actions. Because of the need to maintain the security of the plan, certain information included in recent budgets does not appear this year.

The first part of this statement implies that there is no timetable because this depends on Hanoi and Saigon. The final sentence implies that Nixon does have one but is keeping it secret so as not to tip his hand. We expect this will confuse the enemy as much as it will the Congress.

Until now the only items known to be kept secret in the U.S. budget have been the expenditures of the CIA and the various military intelligence agencies. Now the Vietnam war has been added. This should be an issue for the Democrats. Yet the statement on national priorities just issued by the Democratic Policy Council, their more militant or less pusillanimous wing, does no more than say weakly that while it welcomes the cuts announced in the Pentagon budget, "the Administration's figures on expenditures make it difficult to assess the nature and extent of the military reductions which have been proposed." Protest could hardly be worded more feebly. This is what happens when certain lobbyist-lawyers double in brass as Nixon advisers and liberal Democrats.

The blackout hides the size of the peace dividend. The Administration would like to expunge even the phrase. Budget Director Mayo referred to it scornfully as a "rather oddball concept." The decision to keep it secret must have been taken at the last moment. About ten days before the budget was released the Pentagon information office was still telling reporters that the cost of the war during the next fiscal year would be about $17 billion. When Secretary Laird first gave out this figure last October, he said this would mean a $13 billion saving over the $30 billion the war cost in fiscal '69, its peak.

(Continued on Page Two)

The Culprit Was On The Bench

The jury in the Chicago 7 case was still out after three days when we went to press. One of the Judge's final remarks was illuminating. In imposing a savage 4-year contempt sentence on the chief defense counsel, Mr. Kunstler, Judge Hoffman said crime was on the increase because such lawyers were "waiting in the wings" to help criminals. The remark indicated how foggy was his understanding of the case before him when he could somehow confuse these anti-war idealists with common criminals and their devoted counsel, all honorable veterans of the civil rights movement, with "mouthpieces." The remark helps to explain why this became probably the most unfair trial in U.S. history. When the full record is studied, we believe it will show that the disorder in the courtroom was the product neither of a revolutionary plot nor of Yippie "theatre" but of the sheer unbearable exasperation created day after day for 20 weeks by the Judge's one-sided rulings. We think the prime responsibility for these disgraceful spectacles rests upon the Judge, that he has brought the courts into disrepute with the young and the blacks, and ought to be impeached. "Public respect for the Federal judiciary," Mr. Justice Frankfurter said acidly in the similar Harry Sacher contempt case 17 years ago, "is best enhanced by exacting high standards of judicial competence." The culprit was on the bench.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from Page One)

Total military costs in '69 ("defense by function") were $81.2 billion. But total military costs budgeted for fiscal '71, instead of being $13 billion less than that (or $68.2 billion), are $73.5 billion, or only $7.7 billion less. This means that non-Vietnam military spending is *up* by $5.3 billion. This *increase* in non-Vietnam military spending is itself more than twice as large as total outlays budgeted for natural resources ($2.5 billion) including air and water despite all Nixon's "now or never" rhetoric on pollution.

No Austerity On Strategic Arms

This may understate the realities. Proxmire in a Senate speech Feb. 10 estimated that the Pentagon "has heisted $10 billion of the peace dividend." He takes into account not only Laird's predicted cut in Vietnam war costs but his announcement last Oct. 16 that henceforth the Pentagon would plan its level of forces for one major and one minor wars instead of two major and one minor wars as it has since the Kennedy-Mc Namara period. Proxmire said the money thus saved is going to strategic hardware, including the second phase of the ABM, conversion of Polaris into the MIRVed Poseidon, on which the overruns are now $3 billion; into MIRVed Minuteman III, where the overruns are also about $3 billion; into the Navy, which is getting $2.6 billion to modernize the fleet, an increase of $1 billion over 1967-69 expenditures; and into a huge AWACS, over-the-horizon warning system. "Some $18 billion has already been spent for SAGE and AWACS," Proxmire said of these two anti-bomber systems, "even though the Russians have no modern intercontinental bomber. These huge funds were expended to meet a non-existent threat." This is hardly austere military budgeting.

This brings me to the related blackout the Nixon administration is imposing on military spending and planning. "We have learned," Nixon said in the economic report, "that 1-year planning leads to almost as much confusion as no planning at all." He said that was why he was opening up the books, and making long-range projections "that will enable the people to discuss their choices more effectively." He published a four year projection which shows, among other things, that Nixon's new civilian initiatives including welfare and pollution will go up from $3 billion in the first year to $18 billion in the fourth. Yet there are no similar projections on the military side.

When Budget Director Mayo was on *Meet The Press* Feb. 8,

Get A Whiff Of This

The Nixon administration has come up with a new definition of chemical warfare that would permit agents "whose effects are not lasting." . . . Under the Nixon administration's definition, the way the United States uses tear gas and herbicides in Vietnam is not chemical warfare. But there is no attempt to perpetuate the Kennedy administration's contention that GIs use chemicals in Vietnam to protect civilians, not gain military advantage. Chemical warfare, as newly defined by the Defense Department, is "the employment of chemical agents which result in prolonged incapacitation or death in contrast to the temporary nature of riot control agents (CS) whose effects are not lasting and dissipate quickly."

—George C. Wilson in the Washington Post, *Jan. 31.*

Edwin L. Dale, Jr., of the *New York Times* said "your four year projection of the grand total of government spending under current programs of something like $240 billion is hard to make sense of unless you have an idea of what the Defense assumptions are." Mr. Dale asked whether the grand totals assumed "the current force levels, the pre-Vietnam force levels, the levels at the end of the new fiscal year? What?" The Budget Director replied "we preferred not to be too specific." Mr. Mayo would disclose no more than that the overall 4-year projections assumed "a considerable lessening of the expenditures for Vietnam" and also "the effect of higher prices on all weapons systems" though at a lower rate of inflation. "We have also worked in," he added as a final concession, "what we think is a reasonable projection on the military side." But both the details and the totals on the military side were blacked out.

There is an interesting revelation in this connection at page 77 of the annual report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. It shows that elaborate studies and projections *have* been made on the military as well as the civilian side. It says—

Among the most important steps in this direction have been the interrelated studies conducted through the National Security Council and the Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy. These studies examined alternative defense strategies with their associated costs and alternative nondefense programs. Various defense strategies were translated with rough accuracy into a large number of possible forces and budgets. Similarly alternative nondefense Federal programs were developed.

How can Nixon say that he is making long range 4-year

A Witch Hunt Bill Straight Out Of The McCarthy Era Passes The House

I am for national security but I am against national hysteria that sees an enemy under every bed and a subversive in every closet. This bill gives uninhibited power, without direction or standard, to the Secretary of Defense to tell who can hold a job or have access to defense projects and facilities, whether or not classified information is involved. Just let me read carefully what facilities can be designated as defense facilities. Sections 402 (a) and 404 include:

"(a) any plant, factory, industry, public utility, mine, laboratory, educational institution, research organization, railroad, airport, pier, waterfront installation, canal, dam, bridge, highway, vessel, aircraft, vehicle, pipeline."

Such a facility need not have anything to do with classified information. It would give the Secretary of Defense the power to decide who can have "access" [to any such facility]. The bill would grant virtually dictatorial powers to the Secretary of Defense. Also, the President would have untrammeled power to investigate persons or organizations whether or not they are under consideration for access to classified material. The President must rely upon subordinates. Thus an underling would exercise such inordinate power. An investigation could be inaugurated in the nature of thought control. Dissent, in Vice President Agnew's version, could trigger an inquiry.

—Congressman Celler, dean of the House and Chairman of House Judiciary Committee, speaking (abridged) Jan. 29 against HR 14864, the Defense Facilities and Industrial Security Act of 1970, which passed the House that day 274-65 in a typical spasm of war-time hysteria. It can still be stopped in the Senate. The bill was produced by the House Committee on Internal Security (as the Un-American Activities Committee is now known) where it drew a strong dissent from Rep. Stokes (D. Ohio).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

projections available to "enable the people to discuss their choices more effectively" when the military side of these projections—much the biggest single share—is hidden from them? "We must become increasingly aware," Nixon also said in the Budget Message, "that small decisions today often lead to large cash outlays in the future." Of no part of the budget is this more resoundingly true than the military sector. A speech by Congressman Reuss in Milwaukee Feb. 10 provided a swift glimpse of such "small decisions" and the large cash outlays they entail. "There is a $1.5 billion item for the ABM," Reuss said of the new budget, "expected ultimately to cost anywhere from $10 to $50 billion. There is $87 million for AWACS, a new airborne radar system with an ultimate $15 billion price tag. There is almost a billion dollars for continued deployment of the Navy's new F-14 fighter plane, with an expected total program cost of up to $36 billion. There is $370 million in the budget for a start on the F-15, the Air Force's new superiority jet fighter. Costs of this program are expected to exceed $25 billion." These programs impose a heavy mortgage on future budgets, but these are among the military commitments blacked out.

"Peanuts" For Pollution

If the budget were candid, the public would see that all the projected spending on welfare and pollution are peanuts compared to the military outlays. Of the grand 4-year total of $240 billion, the military portion must be somewhere between a third and a half, or between $80 and $120 billion. These colossal sums imply a continuation of the arms race, indeed a new spiral in it, for that is what the go-ahead decisions on ABM and MIRV mean. The military only have to drag their heels a few months longer and it will be too late for the SALT talks to be anything more than futile palaver.

The budget presentation is shot through with deceit. "For the first time in two full decades," Nixon boasted in the message, "the Federal government will spend more money on human resource programs than on national defense." This was illustrated with a pie chart showing 41 cents of the budget dollar going to human resources and only 36 cents to national defense. But if the government's huge social security and other trust fund receipts are deducted, we can see that the military spends 53 cents of every dollar of the general revenues.

If the huge social security payments and other trust funds are deducted from the "human resources" account, then we see that these get only 7 cents of every dollar of general revenues. Even so, "human resources" are padded by including in them $8.5 billion of veterans benefits, although up to now these have been on the national defense side of the budget as part of the cost of fighting past wars. As for the fight against pollution, this is buried in "natural resources" which altogether get one and two-tenths cents of every dollar in the consolidated budget, *one tenth of a cent less than last year.* The total appropriations asked to fight pollution of the air ($106 million) and water ($465 million) next year total $571 billion. In a budget in which 53 cents of every general revenue dollar goes to the military, only four tenths of a cent will go to save the air we breathe and the water we drink though it may soon be too late to save them. Nixon's anti-pollution rhetoric is miles from his budgetary realities.

Add Advocates Of Force And Violence

Governor Lester Maddox urged Georgia school children yesterday to steal the tires off their school buses rather than allow themselves to be transported for purposes of desegregation. Reacting to a ruling Thursday by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals ordering integration by Feb. 16, Maddox declared: "Students should continue to go back to their old schools and not get on the first darned bus. They ought to flatten the tires. Somebody ought to let the air out of them and steal them."

—*San Francisco Chronicle,* Feb. 7.

More men like Chief Justice Burger and Judge Carswell should be sitting on the bench of the highest judicial authority of this country. If those disruptive justices now holding rein on that Court are permitted to continue their wanton destruction of our governmental process through their usurpation of the legislative authority invested in Congress, this country truly will be ready for revolution. I may well be leading the vanguard.

—Rep. Edwards *(R. Ala.),* Con. Rec. Feb. 5, H639.

How A Narrow-Minded Judge Can Invite Contempt And Provoke Disorder

A trial like that of the D.C. Nine poses formidable problems for the courts. The issues are moral rather than legal. The Nine did not break into the Washington offices of Dow Chemical for purposes of larceny or mischief. They were protesting its production of napalm to burn people alive not only in Vietnam but elsewhere in the course of American counter-insurgency operations. Respect for the courts is destroyed when nine Catholics, clergy and lay, acting out of the deepest moral anguish, are treated on trial as if they were, simply, burglars.

When a similar group of religious dissidents, the Catonsville Nine, were convicted in Baltimore for destroying draft records, U.S. District Judge Roswell Thomsen gave the defendants wide lattitude in presenting their case. There was no disorder in that courtroom. But U.S. District Judge John H. Pratt made the D.C. Nine and counsel feel from the first that his mind was closed. Their request to defend themselves, though made in writing to the Judge about two weeks before trial began, was summarily denied at the last moment on the dubious ground that they had no legal training. The Judge's remarks from the bench about "rumors" he had heard made the defense feel he was acting on information to which it was not privy and which had not been aired in open court.

Early in the trial Defense Counsel Philip J. Hirschkop asked the Judge to disqualify himself. "You've made up your mind," he said with less tact than truth, "about everything in the case except the length of the sentence." A serious outburst occurred when the Judge cut off Sister Malone on the stand when she tried to explain her actions. The Judge said neither the Vietnam war nor Dow's products could be mentioned. This provoked a youthful spectator and precipitated a brawl.

The Judge's face turned red when the jury found them not guilty of burglary (15 years maximum) and convicted them instead of unlawful entry (a misdemeanor, 6 months) and two counts of destroying property (which could be 10 years each). The verdict, though illogical, showed the jury's sensitivity to the moral issues.

The Judge's anger over the verdict may explain the preemptory way he held Mr. Hirschkop in contempt and gave him 30 days in jail. His own lawyer's request for trial before another judge or for three days to prepare a defense were both denied.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senate Committee Investigators Find Vietnam War Far from Over

The staff report released by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Feb. 2, "Vietnam: Dec. 1969," deserves a wide reading in the peace movement. The main conclusion that emerges is that we Americans don't really know what we're doing in Vietnam nor what is really happening there. "We were struck," the authors (staff members James G. Lowenstein and Richard M. Moose) report, "by the fact that no conclusion seems to stand up from one conversation or experience to the next."

The Language Barrier

The language barrier is basic. Even when accompanied by some of the few U.S. officers who speak Vietnamese, the staff members decided it was an "almost hopeless task" to determine what the Vietnamese really think. They visited one village with a bilingual U.S. Colonel and a bilingual U.S. Major. The former reported the villagers were "relaxed" and happy despite intermittent mortar fire. The latter said they were unhappy and had little faith either in the Government or the Communists.

There were briefings at every stop. "Facts and figures are given in such profusion and with such rapidity that it is impossible to analyze or correlate the information." The briefings resemble "commercials." Being briefed, the Foreign Relations men reported, "is somewhat like being told to buy product X without being told what is wrong with it or why to buy product Y." Most significant of all were the subjects never mentioned in any briefings: the outlook for negotiations, the number of desertions from the South Vietnamese army and land reform.

There are statistics on everything else, all optimistic. But not many are believed or believable. "Almost no one," the report says, "seems to believe the HES (Hamlet Evaluation System) statistic that 92% of the population is 'relatively secure'." The number of refugees has been reduced but "in some cases, apparently, by declaring that refugee camps were now economically and socially viable settlements and no longer camps."

Despite the "Phoenix" program to "neutralize" (kill or jail) members of the VC infrastructure, it seems to be pretty much intact. The Chieu Hoi (Open Arms) program for VC defectors seems to get mostly low level VC. One senior U.S. official told them he thought "only about 25% of the ralliers are genuinely defectors." Despite all the talk of elected officials in the countryside "it should be noted that all province and district chiefs are still military officers." The province and municipal councils to be elected in April will be advisory only, "and the power will remain in military hands."

Though no U.S. combat troops are left in the Mekong Delta, there are some 23,000 U.S. advisers there or "only about 15% less than estimated enemy strength in the Delta in December." "Planning in connection with Vietnamization," the report says, "seems vague and incomplete when viewed from the field." Construction work on American bases appears to be continuing. "The talk in Saigon, among Vietnamese as well as Americans, is in terms of keeping some 250,000 troops there for years."

On the political scene "the most frequently heard criticism" of Thieu is that he is becoming like Diem "increasingly autocratic, secretive and isolated." Many believe he has the support of no more than 20% of the population; they give the Communists 15%. The chances of broadening his government are slight. "Most opposition politicians give the impression of being sincerely nationalist and anti-Communist" but at the same time "many favor negotiations and compromise." The report concludes that the war, whether seen from a political or a military point of view, "appears to be not only far from won but far from over."

Even In The Glamorous First Cav

Saigon—Indifference, rancor, disgust, hostility: the war less and less pleases the Americans who wage it. In four months, 109 soldiers of the *First Cav*, America's first air cavalry division, have been charged with refusal to fight. At Saigon, as at Danang, the security services pursue deserters. In most units, more than half the soldiers smoke marijuana. A common sight is the black soldier, with his left fist clenched, in defiance of a war he has never considered his own . . . Yet most of the troops fight well. The pilots drop their bombs on a countryside they do not always know; the artillery men adjust their guns by radar, the foot-soldiers look for "contact" with the enemy. For them, after 6 months in Vietnam, in the field or in barracks, all the Vietnamese are Viet Cong.

—*Jean-Claude Pomonti in* Le Monde, *Jan. 24.*

We record with sorrow the passing of Bertrand Russell, the lifelong inspiration for the best of three generations the world over. No one excelled him in clarity or courage, or the capacity to go on caring. As did others in many far corners of the earth, we loved him like a father.

FOR STONE'S HIDDEN HISTORY

For the enclosed $7.50 send I. F. Stone's book, The Hidden History of The Korean War (Monthly Review Press.)

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly 2/23/70

4420 29th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

4420 29th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20008

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly. 2d Class Postage Paid at Washington, D.C. Published every other Monday except in August at 4420 29th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED